



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,107	03/23/2006	Josef Artelsmair	ARTELSMAIR 5 PCT	4453
25889 7590 04/01/2009 COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576				
EXAMINER				
RALIS, STEPHEN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3742				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/573,107

**Applicant(s)**

ARTELSMAIR, JOSEF

**Examiner**

STEPHEN J. RALIS

**Art Unit**

3742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-850)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/2/2009 and 2/26/2009

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a location within the disclosure to support any further amendments to the claims due to when filing an amendment an applicant should show support in the original disclosure for new or amended claims. See MPEP § 714.02 and § 2163.06 ("Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure.").

***Response to Amendment/Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 02 January 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as set forth below.

***Terminal Disclaimer***

4. The terminal disclaimer filed on 02 January 2008 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application No. 11/883,497 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 2, 10, 11 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hozumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,249,062).

Hozumi et al. discloses a method for controlling a welding process using a melting welding wire (consumptive electrode 209) comprising the steps of: (a) igniting an electric arc (column 1, lines 8-13; column 15, lines 52-56); (b) subsequently conducting welding, the welding being adjusted on the basis of several different welding parameters (column 15, line 16 – column 16, line 53) and controlled by at least one of a control device (control box 40) and a welding current source (voltage source 20 equivalent to current source); and (c) carrying out at least one mechanical adjustment process during the welding to determine the position of the welding wire (consumptive electrode 209) (column 15, line 42 – column 16, line 53) using the welding wire (consumptive electrode 209) as a sensor (column 16, lines 11-53).

With respect to the limitations of claim 2, Hozumi et al. disclose the mechanical adjusting process (moving torch to and/or from the workpiece) satisfying the welding voltage and welding current during the process which would reduce the amount of welding wire material that is melting. Therefore, Hozumi et al. fully meets "during the at least one mechanical adjustment process, the welding parameters are controlled in a manner that no or only little welding wire material melting is effected" given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

With respect to the limitations of claims 10 and 11, Hozumi et al. disclose the process as being an automated welding mode process which would include a trigger signal and settings selected by a user as well as default values.

With respect to the limitations of claims 18-20, Hozumi et al. disclose the process as being an automated welding mode process which would include motion at the beginning, middle and end of the automated welding mode process as disclosed as well as the robot (fixture 18) being controlled by the control box (40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et al. (JP 11058012 A) in view of Hozumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,249,062).

Nishikawa et al. disclose a method of welding wherein several welding parameters, namely current and voltage associated with a wire-to-workpiece contact during the welding process, are used to calculate wire stick-out, thus using the wire as a sensor (English abstract and the discussion at paragraph 20 of the machine generated English translation; see Figures 5 and 6). This sensed wire stick-out is used to adjust torch height during the welding procedure.

Nishikawa et al. disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention, as previously set forth, except for in specifying that the mechanical adjustment "determines the position of the welding wire" and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor.

However, a mechanical adjustment determining the position of the welding wire and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor is known in the art. Hozumi et al. teach a mechanical adjustment determining the position of the welding wire and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor ((column 15, line 42 – column 16, line 53). Hozumi et al. further teach the advantage of such a configuration provides a means to adjust the length of the protruding length consumable electrode to provide a desired welding finishing and quality. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Nishikawa et al. with the sensing and moving of the wire position during welding processing of Hozumi et al. in order to provide a means to adjust the length of the protruding length consumable electrode to provide a desired welding finishing and quality.

10. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita et al. (EP 774317 A1 – Applicant Admitted Prior Art or APAA) in view of Hozumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,249,062).

Mita et al. (APAA) disclose a method for controlling a welding process using a melting welding wire as set forth in the page 1 of the disclosure of the instant application.

Mita et al. (APAA) disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention, as previously set forth, except for in specifying that the mechanical adjustment "determines the position of the welding wire" and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor.

However, a mechanical adjustment determining the position of the welding wire and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor is known in the art. Hozumi et al. teach a mechanical adjustment determining the position of the welding wire and the process being carried out during the welding process as the wire is being used as the sensor (column 15, line 42 – column 16, line 53). Hozumi et al. further teach the advantage of such a configuration provides a means to adjust the length of the protruding length consumable electrode to provide a desired welding finishing and quality. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Mita et al. (APAA) with the sensing and moving of the wire position during welding processing of

Hozumi et al. in order to provide a means to adjust the length of the protruding length consumable electrode to provide a desired welding finishing and quality.

***Remarks***

11. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., determination of the position of the welding wire relative to the workpiece without movement of the welding torch) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).



***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **STEPHEN J. RALIS** whose telephone number is (571)272-6227. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tu Hoang can be reached on 571-272-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen J Ralis/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3742

Stephen J Ralis  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3742

SJR  
March 27, 2009  
/TU B HOANG/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3742